

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 41 through 86 are pending, with Claims 41, 60, 66, and 76 being independent.

The Official Action set forth a restriction requirement between: (I) cancelled Claims 20 through 40; and (II) Claims 41 through 86, which were said to be drawn to a driver. The Official Action withdrew Claims 41 through 86 from consideration via constructive election under MPEP 821.03. The restriction requirement and withdrawal are respectfully traversed.

DISCUSSION OF TELEPHONIC INTERVIEWS

In this regard, Applicant gratefully wishes to acknowledge the courtesies extended by the Examiner during telephonic discussions with Applicant's representative on October 15, 2003, and October 17, 2003. During the discussions, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed how Applicant might obtain consideration of the withdrawn claims. Applicant gratefully understands from the discussions that the Examiner is agreeable to examine the withdrawn claims upon the filing of a Request for Continued Examination. Accordingly, Applicant is filing concurrently herewith a Request for Continued Examination, and respectfully requests that the withdrawn claims be examined.

TRAVERSAL OF RESTRICTION

For completeness, Applicant traverses the restriction requirement, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the same. Applicant requests that the claims of Group II (Claims 41 through 86) be examined on the merits. Applicant respectfully notes that several of the claims, e.g., Claim 76, recite an "apparatus" rather than a driver per se. Applicant submits that all of the claims could be searched by one Examiner without undue effort. Applicant also believes that it is not mandatory to make a restriction requirement in every possible situation. Applicant believes that if one Examiner acts on all of the claims of the present application, overall examining time will be less than if multiple Examiners are involved. Applicant also earnestly believes that the examination of all of the claims by one Examiner in the present application will best ensure uniform prosecution quality. Therefore, in the interest of prosecution economy of time and quality for both the Office and Applicants, Applicant respectfully submits that withdrawal of the restriction requirement in this application is appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: PD-N94026G
Customer No.: 020991

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached at (301) 601-7252.
All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

 11/25/2003
Craig L. Plastrik
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,254

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
Bldg. 001, M/S-A109
P.O. Box 956
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956
(301) 601-7252

DSG